

Reinventing Lucian in Byzantium

PRZEMYSŁAW MARCINIĄK

Εἰ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι σχεδὸν τοῖς αὐτοῦ λόγοις Λουκιανὸς καταψεύδεται, λῆρος φαινόμενος σαφής καὶ τερατολόγος καὶ φλήναφος, ἀλλ᾽ οὖν ἐν τῇ κατ᾽ αὐτὸν δραματουργίᾳ πάνυ μοι δοκεῖ ἀληθέστατος.¹

Even though Lucian lies in nearly all his texts, he appears to be plainly silly, a marvel-monger and a babbler, yet in this story [where he narrates himself] he seems to me very trustworthy.²



1 A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, “Ἀλεξίου τοῦ Μακρεμβολίτου ἀληγορία εἰς τὸν Λούκιον ἡ σύνον,” *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveschenija* 1899, 19. For Makrembolites, Lucian, the author of the text, equals most likely Lucian the narrator.

2 This phrase most likely also alludes to Lucian’s statement from the *True History*: “κανὲν γὰρ δῆ τοῦτο ἀληθεύσω λέγων δτι ψεύδομαι” (*Ver. Hist.* 4). On this passage see A. Georgiadou and D. H. J. Larmour, *Lucian’s Science-Fiction Novel True History: Interpretation and Commentary* (Leiden, 1997), 57–58. Makrembolites’ allegory was briefly discussed by M. A. Poljakovskaja, “Tolkovanje povesti ‘Lukij, ili osel’ Alekseem Makrembolitom,” *VizVrem* 34 (1973): 137–40, and P. Roilos, *Amphoterglossia: A Poetics of the Twelfth-Century Medieval Novel* (Cambridge, MA, 2005), 134–35. See also a similar statement by Theodore Prodromos, who wrote, quoting Lucian’s *Calumniae non temere credendum*: “τοῦτο γε μόνον οὐχὶ ψευσάμενος” (PG 133:1293). Perhaps we see in both Prodromos’s and Makrembolites’ texts a common *topos* of Lucian the Liar.

If not stated otherwise all translations in English are mine.

This sentence, which opens Alexios Makrembolites’ fourteenth-century allegorical interpretation of Lucian’s *Lucius or the Ass*, illustrates well the “Lucian paradox” in the Byzantine period.³ To use the words of Barry Baldwin, Lucian was praised because of his style, but deplored because of the content of his works;⁴ he was also probably the only Byzantine school author who openly attacked and criticized Christians, yet he was read and esteemed by the Byzantines.

“Father of the satire,” one of the most prolific writers and rhetors of the imperial period, he penned around eighty surviving works (although some of them are considered to be spurious). Surprisingly enough, apart from one anecdote preserved by Galen (*Ad Hippocratis epidemias* 2.6.29), there are no testimonies concerning Lucian from his own time.⁵ Lucian was born in Samosata on the Euphrates, in a place where

3 See A. Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature (850–1000)*, ed. C. Angelidi (Athens, 2006), 295–97.

4 B. Baldwin, “The Church Fathers and Lucian,” in *Roman and Byzantine Papers*, London Studies in Classical Philology 21 (Amsterdam, 1989), 350. This seems also to be suggested by Phorios, who describes Lucian’s style as “οὐ πρέπων ὑποθέσεσιν” (*Bibliotheca*, cod. 128).

5 The first author to mention Lucian is Lactantius. Galen’s text is preserved in Arabic translation; see G. Strohmaier, “Übersehenes zur Biographie Lukians,” *Philologus* 120 (1976): 117–22; cf. also J. Hall, *Lucian’s Satire* (New York, 1981), 4–6.

Greek and Syriac-Aramaic cultures coexisted.⁶ It is possible that his mother tongue was Aramaic, whereas Greek was perhaps his second language.⁷ Therefore, Lucian represented the model of Attic style that the Byzantines were seeking for it was something he acquired through study, not something he was born with. As Nigel Wilson put it, “Such men [i.e., the Byzantines] wanted to be Atticists like Lucian and hoped that their pupils would acquire the same skill.”⁸ Yet it would be a misunderstanding to see Lucian only as an excellent stylist. Lucian was a very popular writer—as indicated by the number of extant manuscripts, which exceeds 180.⁹ He was read, commented on, and imitated.

In his book *Lucian in the Two Hesperias*, Michael Zappala describes, very briefly, various interpretive frameworks that were applied to Lucian in the Byzantine period: the atheist, the mocker, the stylist, and the poet.¹⁰ Zappala’s analysis, however, is quite limited in its scope. While discussing the satirist’s function as the master of style, he focuses predominantly on Photios’s opinions while ignoring rich material from later periods. Nonetheless, these are interesting markers that can be further investigated by examining how Lucian and his works were constantly reinterpreted and reinvented in Byzantium. Therefore, my object in what follows is to explore more thoroughly some of the issues connected with Lucianic traditions in Byzantium: Byzantine opinions on Lucian as an atheist, his place in the Byzantine educational system, and finally the patterns of Lucianic reception in Byzantium.

6 The bibliography on Lucian is very rich. The standard work is J. Bompaire, *Lucien écrivain* (Paris, 1958). For a good overview of Lucian’s literary techniques see G. Anderson, *Lucian: Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic* (Leiden, 1976). On the epigrams supposedly penned by Lucian see B. Baldwin, “The Epigrams of Lucian,” *Phoenix* 29, no. 4 (1975): 311–35.

7 See H.-G. Nesselrath, “Lukian von Samosata,” in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, ed. G. Schöllgen et al. (Stuttgart, 2009), 677.

8 N. Wilson, “Some Observations on the Fortunes of Lucian,” in *Filologia, Papirologia, Storia dei Testi: Giornate di studio in onore di Antonio Carlini* (Pisa, 2007), 54.

9 M. Wittek, “Bibliographie: Liste des manuscrits de Lucien,” *Scriptorium* 6 (1952): 309–23. Although many of these manuscripts were copied after 1400 in Italy and other western countries, there exist a fair number of earlier texts as well.

10 M. O. Zappala, *Lucian of Samosata in the Two Hesperias: An Essay in Literary and Cultural Translation* (Potomac, 1990), 20–31.

The Atheist in the Scholia: The Byzantines on Lucian

In the (in)famous lemma from the *Souda*,¹¹ Lucian is a paradigmatic atheist, punished after his death for blasphemy and anti-Christianity: “διὸ καὶ τῆς λύττης ποινὰς ἀρκούσας ἐντῷ παρόντι δέδωκεν, ἐν δὲ τῷ μέλλοντι κληρονόμος τοῦ αἰωνίου πυρὸς μετὰ τοῦ Σατανᾶ γενήσεται” (“wherefore he paid sufficient penalty for his rage in this life, but in the life to come he will inherit with Satan a share of the Eternal Fire”).¹² Lucian is defined as βλάσφημος, δύσφημος, and ἄθεος. The hatred of the lemma in the *Souda* toward Lucian is explained in the text itself: the Syrian writer attacked Christianity in *The Passing of Peregrinus* (in fact Christianity is mentioned twice in his works: in *Peregrinus* and *Alexander the False Prophet*).¹³

Yet Lucian was perceived as more than just an ἄθεος in the sense of pagan. He was a true atheist, a person who treated all manifestations of religious superstition in the same way. As Lactantius says, Lucian “diis et hominibus non pepercit” (*Divinarum institutionum* 1.9.8). Isidore of Pelousion speaks of some poets (οἱ δὲ τῶν ποιητῶν τρόφιμοι) who called him δύσφημος because he mocked the gods.¹⁴ Though it is not clear who those poets were (certainly they were pagans), Isidore’s testimony is not far from that of the *Souda*. Similarly, Photios writes that Lucian mocked the old gods (ἐν οἷς σχεδὸν ἀπασι τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων καμῳδεῖ, τὴν τε τῆς θεοπλαστίας αὐτῶν πλάνην καὶ μωρίαν).¹⁵

11 *Suidae Lexicon*, ed. A. Adler (Leipzig, 1933), pars 3, λ 683. This lemma, according to Adler’s edition, is taken from Hesychius; but as Barry Baldwin aptly noticed, Hesychius, characterized in the *Souda* as “a man full of Hellenic drivel,” cannot be a source of Christian attack on a pagan writer. See Baldwin, “Church Fathers and Lucian,” 352. The history of locating the sources of the lemma is in fact very complicated and well summarized in D. A. Christidis, “Τὸ ἄρθρο τῆς Σούδας γιὰ τὸν Λουκιανὸν καὶ ὁ Ἀρέθας,” *ΕΕΦΣΠΘ* 16 (1977): 417–49.

12 www.stoa.org. English translation, s.v. Λουκιανός, accessed 5 October 2014.

13 *De morte Peregrini* 11–14, 16. In *Alexander* Christians are mentioned many times and are associated with Epicurean philosophy. However, the antihero of the story is the false prophet Alexander, and Christians are not presented in a negative light.

14 *Isidore de Péline, Lettres I (lettres 1214–1413)*, ed. P. Evieux, SC 422 (Paris, 1997), no. 1338, 32–40; analysis of this fragment in Christidis, “Τὸ ἄρθρο τῆς Σούδας,” 426–27.

15 Photios, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 128, ed. R. Henry; Photius, *Bibliothèque* (Paris, 1959–77), 2:102–3. See this fragment, with the

The high point of anti-Lucian sentiment comes, somewhat paradoxically, with perhaps his most important scholiast, Bishop Arethas. Lucianic scholia are an extremely interesting, though underappreciated, source. They exist only in the old edition of Rabe, whose organization seems to have created a false impression that scholastic activity regarding Lucian was predominantly a matter of the ninth and tenth centuries.¹⁶ The conclusion that Lucian was commented on mainly in the ninth and tenth centuries, however, would be too rash.¹⁷ Moreover, scholars signal that later scholia exist. In the manuscript *Vindobonensis phil. gr. 123*, for instance, one can find scholia, “souvent illisibles,” dating from the twelfth to the fourteenth century.¹⁸ Be that as it may, it seems that Jean Schneider is right in saying that a systematic study of Lucian was not conducted before the Renaissance.¹⁹

Arethas’s scholia, which form the bulk of the edited Byzantine part of these commentaries, present themselves as transcriptions of heated debates with Lucian. Once again the Syrian writer is called ἄθεος, διαβόλευς, κακοδαιμων, and many other names. In his recent book on the scholia of Arethas, Russo identified eight “points of debate,” issues that the bishop felt obliged to comment on: Lucian’s opinions on God and Christians, his negation of divine providence, theological relativism, negation of the immortality of a soul, affirmation of homosexuality, and obviously his

accusations against the philosopher Peregrinus.²⁰ At least two similar accusations—denial of the immortality of the individual human soul and denial of the divine providence of individual human beings—were also directed against Aristotle in late antiquity and the Byzantine period.²¹ Arethas’s list is curious because it looks as if he treated Lucian not as a satirist, but rather as a serious philosopher or even a theologian. This was a mistake that Photios did not make, when he said that Lucian’s opinion was that he did not have an opinion (*Bibliotheca*, cod. 128). Still, Arethas’s preoccupation with Lucian, coupled with pernicious commentaries, make the modern reader wonder why the bishop bothered to read and comment on a writer whom he apparently hated. Other scholiasts, like Basil of Adada (ninth-century clergyman, the earliest identifiable scholiast of Lucian) and Alexander of Nicaea (early tenth century), were not so evidently anti-Lucianic. Westerink suggests that Arethas’s fierce invective in fact served the purpose of protecting himself against the accusation of impiety.²² No single factor, however, sufficiently explains why Arethas was so anti-Lucianic. Possibly, his attitude was a combination of his bellicose nature, cautiousness, and perhaps most importantly a tendency to treat Lucian as a much more serious author

20 G. Russo, *Contestazione e conservazione: Luciano nell’esegesi di Arete* (Berlin, 2011), 13. On Peregrinus see an in-depth analysis by D. Fields, “The Reflections of Satire: Lucian and Peregrinus,” *TAPA* 143, no. 1 (2013): 213–45, esp. 228.

21 The list of anti-Aristotelian accusations was recently compiled by B. Bydén, “No Prince of Perfection?: Byzantine Anti-Aristotelianism from the Patristic Period to Pletho,” in *Power and Subversion in Byzantium*, ed. D. Angelov and M. Saxby (Farnham, 2013), 156–65.

22 L. G. Westerink, “Marginalia by Arethas in Moscow Greek MS 231,” *Byzantion* 42 (1972): 201: “As regards the character and purpose of Arethas’ notes, though some of them are of course real scholia, explaining the subject-matter, the syntax or the vocabulary, they usually tend to be rather polemical, or simply emotional, expressing impatience, indignation, contempt, rarely also praise. The tendency is of course a very human one and cannot be claimed for any particular individual or period; yet it seems that Arethas contributed a great deal to making it a tradition in Byzantine scholarship, and that it is a typical expression of his bellicose nature. . . . The most obvious example is Lucian, the Anatole France of the Roman Empire, and at the same time, surprisingly, the favourite author of the higher clergy (Photius, Arethas, Alexander of Nicaea). The fierce invective against such writers, besides relieving the critic’s ambivalent emotions, had the twofold practical advantage of protecting both the owner and the book. . . . Arethas, as a result of his occupation with classical authors, was at least twice formally indicted for impiety.”

commentary of N. Wilson, *An Anthology of Byzantine Prose* (Berlin, 1971), 46–47.

16 H. Rabe, ed., *Scholia in Lucianum* (Leipzig, 1906). Rabe described many of the *scholia recentiora* as “wertlos”; see “Die Ueberlieferung der Lukianscholien,” *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse*, 1902, e.g. at 721. Cf. also Wilson’s remark, “Some Observations,” 57: “But the main body of the notes may well be earlier and should probably be interpreted as evidence that Lucian was read in the schools.”

17 Rabe, *Scholia*, VI: “Cum perpenderem omnia, in dies magis mihi persuasi ex magna scholiorum copia, quibus quondam Luciani dialogi instructierant, minimam tantum partem servatam esse, iam ante Basilii et Arethae aetatem scholia ascripta fuisse manifestum est.”

18 See *Lucien, Œuvres*, vol. 1, ed. and trans. J. Bompaire (Paris, 1993), xcvi. The codex is described in H. Hunger, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, vol. 1 (Vienna, 1961), 233–34.

19 J. Schneider, “Les scholies de Lucien et la tradition paroemiographique,” in *Lucien de Samosate: Actes du colloque de Lyon organisé au Centre d’Études Romaines et Gallo-Romaines les 30 septembre – 1^{er} octobre 1993*, ed. A. Billault (Lyon, 1994), 204.

than Lucian himself wanted to be. As Barry Baldwin suggested, “Arethas was not concerned to establish Lucian as Anti-Christ.”²³ What we witness in Arethas’s criticism is perhaps the bishop’s personal way of making sense of Lucian’s text.²⁴ It is unclear, however, whether the anti-Christian line of argumentation in Arethas’s works and in the *Souda* is an isolated exception, like perhaps Michael Gabras’s criticism of Lucian centuries later;²⁵ or rather represents a more common attitude. Be that as it may, Lucian’s works do contain elements clearly directed against the Christians; the entire thirteenth chapter of *Peregrinus*, where Lucian calls Christians “κακοδαιμόνες” and Christ “a crucified sophist,” proves this clearly. It would be impossible to call Lucian “anima naturaliter Christiana” or to pray to Christ to save him, as John Mauropos did in the case of Plato and Plutarch, because these two were so close in their words and ways to Christ’s laws.²⁶

I would like to suggest that Lucian’s anti-Christian remarks were purposefully downplayed and his anti-Christian dialogues tacitly ignored by Byzantine literati.²⁷ He was recognized as a satirist, mocker, rhetor, and the author of playful works, rather than a real philosopher. This was necessary in order to make Lucian a suitable school author, for a school author’s ideas cannot

be morally inadequate nor perceived as anti-Christian. Moreover, it was safer to deal with his works when they were located in a different conceptual space from the texts of Aristotle or Plato, or any other philosopher for that matter. And above all he became a paradigmatic Attic writer: this must also have helped overcome the impact of his potentially dangerous ideas.²⁸

The Teacher and the Stylist

As scholars have already noted,²⁹ at some point Lucian must have become a school author.³⁰ However, since the term “school author” is a somewhat elusive description, to put it differently, Lucian must have been recognized as a useful author in educational practice because of his Attic Greek. Greek dramas had a similar status in education: they served as lexical repositories.³¹ It is difficult to point to a precise moment when Lucian may have become a part of the Byzantine *curriculum studiorum*. Warren Treadgold argued that Photios, in his *Bibliotheca*, included only texts that were not part of the standard *curriculum studiorum*.³² Since Photios discussed Lucian’s writings, can we therefore assume that at this time (in the ninth century) Lucian was not read in schools? This is certainly a tempting suggestion, since it

23 Baldwin, “Church Fathers and Lucian,” 351.

24 Later testimonies concerning Lucian, with very rare exceptions, do not mention his impiety and the ungodly/anti-Christian character of his writings, or at least not directly. Some of the testimonies are completely neutral, like the opinion of Gregoras; cf. *Nicephori Gregorae historiae Byzantinae*, ed. I. Bekker and L. Schopen, CSHB (Bonn, 1829–55), 2:924: “οὐ γὰρ ἴσμεν ὅντος ἐκείνου νεκροῦ πυνθάνεσθαι ἡ τε ἔφασκε τότε καὶ ἡ νῦν. εἰ δὲ ἀναγκαῖον ὑμῖν ἐστι τούτῳ, ἔστι παρ’ Ἑλλησίτις σοφιστῆς νεκρικούς διαλόγους ποιούμενος. ἐκεῖνος, εἰ βούλεσθε, κομεῖ τὰ ἐκείνου λεγθέντα τε καὶ λεγόμενα πάνω καλῶς.” Baldwin misinterprets Gregoras’s statement when he says “especially when Nicephorus goes on to praise the style and deplore the content”; see Baldwin, “Church Fathers and Lucian,” 350. In my opinion Gregoras is merely stating ironically that there was a writer who could describe conversations with dead people, whereas he cannot.

25 D. A. Christidis, “Theodore Phialites and Michael Gabras: A Supporter and an Opponent of Lucian in the 14th Century,” in *Lemmatata*, ed. M. Tziatzi et al. (Berlin, 2015), 542–49.

26 P. de Lagarde, *Joannis Euchaitorum Metropolitae quae in codice Vaticano Graeco 676 supersunt* (Abhandlungen der Historisch-Philologische Klasse der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen), vol. 28 (Göttingen, 1882), no. 43.

27 As Christidis points out, the folios containing *De morte Peregrini* were removed from some manuscripts. Christidis, “Τὸ ἄρθρο τῆς Σούδας,” 446.

28 N. G. Wilson, “The Church and Classical Studies in Byzantium,” *Antike und Abendland* 16 (1970): 71: “Lucian had gone so far as to pour scorn on the early Christians. Yet he had redeeming features. Much of his ridicule was directed at pagan cults and theology, and so was welcome to the church. But it must have been his merits as a writer of prose that enabled him to maintain his popularity.”

29 See for instance A. Markopoulos, “De la structure de l’école byzantine: Le maître, les livres et le processus éducatif,” in *Lire et écrire à Byzance*, ed. B. Mondrain (Paris, 2006), 88 (where he lists the dialogues of Lucian among the school texts).

30 N. G. Wilson simply states: “A certain number of other prose authors continued to be read, including some who had no obvious practical value or were not regularly incorporated into a school reading list. Among them were the Atticists of the Roman empire, regarded as the equals of the Attic masters whom they attempted to mimic. For this reason Lucian and Aristides were popular and received the honour of being commented on” (*Scholars of Byzantium* [London, 1983], 25).

31 R. Webb, “A Slavish Art? Language and Grammar in Late Byzantine Education and Society,” *Dialogos: Hellenic Studies Review* 1 (1994): 90; N. Gaul, “Moschopoulos, Lopadiotes, Phrankopoulos (?), Magistros, Staphidakes: Prosopographic und Methodologisches zur Lexikographie des frühen 14. Jahrhunderts,” in *Lexicologica Byzantina*, ed. E. Trapp and S. Schönauer (Bonn, 2008), 163.

32 W. J. W. Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius* (Washington, DC, 1980), 6.

would give us a *terminus post quem*, but it is difficult to prove. When it comes to the manuscript evidence, apart from the famous Harley 5694 (dated to ca. 912–914), which according to some scholars may have contained all of Lucian's works,³³ there is also Vaticanus gr. 90 (tenth century), which transmits seventy-five of them (including *The Passing of Peregrinus*); Conv. Soppr. 77 (also tenth century) contains fifty-four of the satirist's texts. This may indicate an intensified interest in Lucian in this period.³⁴ According to Wilson, extensive Lucianic scholia suggest that he was used as a didactic tool.³⁵ In the later periods, his use at school is also proved by the fact that paraphrases of Lucian's work functioned as *schede*, grammatical exercises.³⁶ One can find examples of such texts in the manuscripts Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 92 and Parisinus gr. 2556.³⁷ Lucian's didactic usefulness can

be divided into three categories: (1) Lucian's works as a source of vocabulary, (2) didactic texts modeled on his works, and (3) Lucian as a model of Attic style.

Lucianic texts had been used as sources for lexicographical works throughout the Byzantine period. The Syrian writer is one of the authorities referred to in the Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων (the so-called Lexicum Bachmannianum or Lexicum Bekkeri VI, eighth to ninth century).³⁸ Manuscript Coisl. 345 (tenth century) preserves a similar lexicon built from words and fragments taken from the texts of Lucian (Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Λουκιανοῦ).³⁹ Its author used scholia, but in such a way that they could be consulted

ἀλιεύς 6) [fols. 225v–226r]; Anonymous: a paraphrase of a passage from Lucian (*Ἀναβίοῦντες ἢ ἀλιεύς 4–5*) [fol. 226r–v]. In cod. Paris. gr. 2556, fol. 79r there exists a fragmentary preserved *scheda* based on the dialogue between Diogenes and Alexander (*Dial. mort. 13*); see I. Polemis, “Προβλήματα τῆς βιζαντινῆς σχεδογραφίας,” *Hellenika* 45 (1995): 277–302, esp. 279. The preserved fragment runs as follows (I am indebted to Dr. Nikolaos Zagklas for his help with the diplomatic transcription): . . . ἐκλιπών ὑπισχνεῖται δὲ πτολιμαῖος (Πτολιμαῖος) ὁ ὑπασπιστής, ἦν ποτ' ἐκκυδοῖ· (supra lineam: ἐκ τῶν θορύβων) |² μάν ἄγαγή (supra lineam: φέρη) τῶν ἐν ποσὶ. τῷ θεῖον συνασπισμὸν πλουτῆσαι σχολὴν³ ἐξ αἰγυπτον ἀπαγαγών με ταφῇ την ει [= τιν] παραδοῦναι ὡς τῶν αἰγυπτίων |⁴ θεῶν γεγονός τις εἰς ισαξίας (supra lineam: δμοτίμου) αὐτοῖς δόξης τε καὶ τιμῆς ἐπιτύχοιμι. |⁵ οὐ γελάσω οὖν ὃ Ἀλέξανδρε, ὅρῶν ὅτι καὶ ἐν Ἄδου ἔτι σοι |⁶ μωρίαι εἰσὶ καὶ ἐπίζεις ὡς συναρθμηθεῖς, Ἄννουσβις, ὡμμένοις |⁷ ὥδε νεκροῖς, ἢ Ὀστρις γενήσῃ; πλὴν ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ὃ θειότατε μὴ |⁸ ἐπίσι στοίχει γενέσθαι. οὐ γὰρ θέμις τῶν ἀπαξ διαπλεύσαι |⁹ ὡμόλογημένων τὴν λίμνην, καὶ ἐξ τὸ εἴσω τοῦ στομίου παρελθεῖν, |¹⁰ ἀνοδὸν ἐσχηκέναι τινά. οὐ γὰρ ῥάθυμῳ ἐντύχης τῷ τοῦ Διός |¹¹ ἥν γινωσκ’ Αἰσκῷ, πω τέ καὶ ἀμελεῖ. οὐτε δὲ τῆς τοῦ πυλωροῦ |¹² ἀν ἐκαταφρόνη τοῦ κερβέρου, Ὁλακῆς πειραθῆς. . . .

What is also important is that the same dialogue was used in the anonymous imitation of the dialogue of the dead between Charon, Hermes, and Alexander (see below).

38 The texts in Bachmann's and Bekker's editions are critically edited in I. C. Cunningham, ed., *Synagogue: Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων; Texts of the Original Version and of MS. B* (Berlin, 2003). On the Lucianic reference see *ibid.*, ε 760 (p. 227). See also C. Theodoridis, “Kritische Bemerkungen zu der neuen Ausgabe der Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων,” *JÖB* 57 (2007): 35–48. *Synagogue* is a lexicon that draws on an earlier text ascribed to St. Cyril. The scholiasts of Lucian used some enlarged version of the *Synagogue*; see H. Erbse, *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika* (Berlin, 1950), 67. Other editions cited at Cunningham, *Synagogue*, 17–18.

39 On the possible relation of the manuscript to Arethas see P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin* (Paris, 1971), 228; for a more detailed discussion on this manuscript see M. de Leeuw, “Der Coislinianus 345 im Kloster Megisti Lavra (Athos),” *ZPapEpig* 131 (2000): 58–64. First edition A. Bachmann, *Anecdota Graeca*, vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1828), 319–48; minor corrections proposed by P. Boudreux, “Le lexique de Lucien,” *Revue de philologie* n.s. 30 (1906): 51–53.

33 On the transmission of Lucian's texts see E. Marquis, “Les textes de Lucien à tradition simple,” *Revue d'histoire des textes*, n.s., 8 (2013): 1–36; on Harley 5694 at 6–8. See also L. M. Ciolfi, “Κληρονόμος τοῦ αἰώνιου πυρός μετὰ τοῦ Σατανᾶ? La fortune de Lucien entre sources littéraires et tradition manuscrite,” *Porphyra* 24 (2015): 39–54. J. Bompaire, “À la recherche du stemma des manuscrits grecs de Lucien: Contribution à l'histoire de la critique,” *Revue d'histoire des textes* 23 (1993): 1–29.

34 Perhaps further proof of Lucian's popularity in the tenth century is the testimony of Liutprand; see C. Newlin, “Lucian and Liutprand,” *Speculum* 2 (1927): 447–48. For possible Lucianic echoes in tenth-century hagiography see C. Angelidi, “The Dreams of a Woman: An Episode from the Life of Andrew the Fool,” in *Myriobiblos: Essays on Byzantine Literature and Culture*, ed. T. Antonopoulou, S. Kotzabassi, and M. Loukaki (Boston, 2015), 33–34.

35 Wilson, “Some Observations,” 57.

36 On the *schede* in the didactic context see I. Nesseris, “Η Παιδεία στην Κωνσταντινούπολη κατά τον 12ο αιώνα” (PhD dissertation, Ioannina, 2014), passim. For a reappraisal of schedography see P. A. Agapitos, “Grammar, Genre and Politics in Komnenian Constantinople: Redefining a Scientific Paradigm in the History of Byzantine Literature,” *JÖB* 64 (2014): 1–22.

37 Vat. Pal. gr. 92 most likely comes from Southern Italy; see D. Arnesano, *La minuscola “barocca”: Scritture e libri in Terra d’Otranto nei secoli XIII e XIV (Fonti medievali e moderne 12)* (Galatina, 2008), 78; for Epirus as the place of origin see I. D. Polemis, “Μία ὑπόθεση γιὰ τὴν προέλευση τῆς σχεδογραφικῆς συλλογῆς τοῦ κώδικα Vaticanus Palatinus graecus 92,” in *Αντιφλήγσις: Studies on Classical, Byzantine and Modern Greek Literature and Culture; in Honour of John-Theophanes A. Papademetriou*, ed. E. Karamalengou and E. D. Makrygianni (Stuttgart, 2009), 558–65. I owe this information and citation to Dr. Nikolaos Zagklas. I. Vassis, “Των νέων Φιλολόγων Παλαισμάτα: Η συλλογή σχεδών του κώδικα Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 92,” *Hellenika* 52 (2002): 56 (no. 133); Michael Attikos: a paraphrase of Lucian's *Kataplous* [fol. 188r–v]; 62 (nos. 191 and 193); Anonymous: a paraphrase of a passage from Lucian (*Ἀναβίοῦντες ἢ*

without reading the actual text of Lucian's works. Many *lemmata* begin with “ὅτι . . .,” and concern linguistic,⁴⁰ historical, and cultural issues, sometimes with reference to contemporary times.⁴¹ Centuries later, Lucian's works were also the source of the *Selection of Attic Words* by Thomas Magistros.⁴² The Palaiologan scholar used many of the satirist's dialogues, most extensively the *Dialogues of the Dead*, which he referred to in sixteen places.⁴³

But Lucian's didactic or rhetorical usefulness was not limited to providing a selection of Attic words. I would argue that some works modeled on Lucianic texts were written primarily for educational purposes. Perhaps the most striking example of using Lucian's satire as a model for didactic work is Theodore Prodromos's *Bion Prasis*: it has usually been classified, and even dismissed, as an unsuccessful imitation of Lucian's work of the same name.⁴⁴ The Byzantine version, however, is not a simple imitation; it is, rather, a sequel in the most modern sense of the word. Prodromos replaced the lives of the philosophers with the lives of the important ancient writers (Homer, Hippocrates, Aristophanes, Euripides, Demosthenes, and Pomponius, a legal authority from the Roman period). The text's ultimate purpose, if indeed there was one, is difficult to ascertain. As I have argued elsewhere,⁴⁵ this text may discuss the Byzantines' appropriating the ancient literary heritage, and it may have been written for Prodromos's students. Yet perhaps we can also detect a satirical note, as Prodromos discusses the appropriation but at the same time mocks Byzantine writers, including himself, as overdependent

on ancient models, thus satirizing the Byzantine faith in the infinite usefulness of ancient authors.⁴⁶

Another example of the use of Lucianic texts for school purposes comes from the Palaiologan period: a poem by Manuel Philes which transposes a fragment of Lucian's *Herodotus or Aëtion* (c. 5) from prose into the Byzantine dodecasyllable.⁴⁷ Philes not only changes the form (see the translation in the appendix, below)—though there is nothing particularly unusual about this—but also simplifies Lucian's descriptions, replacing, for instance, δαῖς (pinetorch) with λαμπάς and λόγχη (spear) with ξίφος.⁴⁸ Philes also changes the description's conclusion and emphasizes, as it seems, a different aspect than Lucian, since Philes implies that even Alexander the Great placed love above war.⁴⁹ Although perhaps not a *schedos* per se, this piece looks like a text written as a didactic exercise.

Finally, Lucian was also explicitly praised as an excellent stylist: his name consistently appears on lists of authors whose style is recommended to students of Greek. Perhaps the first influential Byzantine author to extensively praise the satirist was Photios: in his *Bibliotheca*, he describes Lucian's style as excellent and unique because of its clarity and expressivity; moreover, his prose, he says, is “like melody.”⁵⁰ The style's purity

40 See Bachmann, *Anecdota Graeca* 2:323: “ὅτι χρῆσθαι λέγοντιν Αθηναῖοι, ἀλλ’ οὐ χρᾶσθαι.”

41 See Bachmann, *Anecdota Graeca* 2:341: “ὅτι Γάλλοι οἱ πάντη ἀπόκοποι τὰ αἰδοῖα· οὓς νῦν καρζιμάς καλοῦσιν”—this is the rarest form of eunuchism. The term describes eunuchs who lacked both testicles and penis. On both *galli* and *καρζιμάς* see K. M. Ringrose, *The Perfect Servant: Eunuchs and the Social Construction of Gender in Byzantium* (Chicago, 2003), 9, 15, and *passim*.

42 T. Magistros, *Ecloga vocum Atticarum*, ex rec. et cum prol. F. Ritschelii (Halle, 1832, repr. Hildesheim, 1970).

43 *Ibid.*, 431–34.

44 C. Robinson, *Lucian and His Influence in Europe* (London, 1979), 69–73. See the new edition by E. Cullhed in P. Marciniak, *Taniec w roli Terytyesa: Studia nad satyrą bizantyńską* [A Dance in the Role of Thersites: Studies on Byzantine Satire] (Katowice, 2016), 185–203.

45 P. Marciniak, “Theodore Prodromos' *Bion prasis*—A Reappraisal,” *GRBS* 53 (2013): 219–37.

46 Nikolaos Zagklas argued recently that a work could have multiple functions in different contexts (e.g., classroom, *theatron*, etc.); see N. Zagklas, “Theodore Prodromos: The Neglected Poems and Epigrams (Edition, Translation, and Commentary)” (PhD dissertation, Vienna, 2014), 70–84.

47 Edited in *Manuelis Philae Carmina*, ed. E. Miller, vol. 2 (Paris, 1857; repr. Amsterdam 1967), 336–37 (appendix 3). Philes transposed the Psalms into political verses; see G. Stickler, *Manuel Philes und seine Psalmenmetaphrase* (Vienna, 1992).

48 Perhaps the main aim of the exercise was to show the students how to use various language registers and how to write a versified text using a prose model. Moreover, Lucianic ekphrasis might be seen as especially fitting for the students.

49 Lucian, *Herodotus or Aëtion*, 6: “All this is not needless triviality and a waste of labour. Aëtion is calling attention to Alexander's other love—War—, implying that in his love of Roxana he did not forget his armour” (trans. Kilburn). Philes reworked it in the following way:

However, it is not just the picture and story that you see,
But one can learn from the things one sees
that even Alexander himself as he went to get married
was kept away from the works of Ares.

50 See Wilson, *Anthology*, 47. Nigel Wilson described Photios's praise as “extravagant,” since Lucian frequently uses vocabulary that

or lucidity (*καθαρότης*) and limpidity (*εὐκρινεία*) are rhetorical categories taken from Hermogenes' treatise *On Various Kinds of Style*.⁵¹ Zappala links Photios's use of terms such as "lucidity" and "limpidity" with the fact that the patriarch saw in Lucian's writings "Christian" style, because for him prose style also has an ethical quality. I think, however, that Photios praises Lucian simply, or mostly, for his qualities as a rhetor and writer. That Lucian was regarded as an excellent rhetor, and thus perhaps as a writer useful in the educational process, can be also seen from the epigram ascribed to Leo the Philosopher:

[Εἰς Λουκιανόν.]

Ρήτωρ, σοφιστής, ἀλλὰ καὶ λογογράφος,
ρήτωρ μέγιστος ὅλων τε τῶν ρήτόρων,
ρήτωρ ἀγαθός, πρηστήριος τὴν φύσιν,
ρήτωρ δεξιός, ἐμπλεως κομπασμάτων,
ρήτωρ ἀληθῆς τοὺς θεωνύμους ὅλους
πιμπρῶν, ἀναιρῶν, ἔκτεφρῶν πολυτρόπως
λόγοις μυρίοις ἐν συνετῇ καρδίᾳ.⁵²

A rhetor, sophist, but also a writer,
Rhetor greatest of all the rhetors,
Good rhetor, with a fiery nature,
A righteous rhetor, full of boasts,
A true rhetor, who all those so-called gods
Burns, destroys, turns to ashes in many ways
With tens of thousands of words in his intelligent mind.

Regardless of its authorship or the date of its composition, this short epigram points to the qualities of Lucian as a rhetor—actually the greatest rhetor

does not seem to be genuinely Attic. Invoking the authority of the Syrian in the lexica of the Attic dialect, however, would seem to contradict Wilson's statement.

51 Zappala, *Lucian of Samosata*, 25–26; and more thoroughly G. Kustas, "The Literary Criticism of Photius: A Christian Definition of Style," *Hellenika* 17 (1962): 132–69.

52 E. Cougny, ed., *Epigrammatum anthologia Palatina cum Planudeis et appendice nova* (Paris, 1890), ep. 224. Krumbacher was convinced that the attribution to Leo the Philosopher is right ("sicher gehören ihm mehrere epigrammatische Gedichte auf Lukian, auf die Batrachomyomachia"); see K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1897), 722.

of all—and at the same time reinforces the notions of Lucian as the "destroyer of gods" and as a satirist. Isidore of Pelousion classified Lucian as a cynic, Arethas implied in his polemic that he treated him as a philosopher, but it is undeniably in the role of rhetor that he appears most importantly.⁵³

As noted above, Photios used categories adopted from Hermogenes' writings to describe Lucian's style. Twelfth-century descriptions of Lucian's style may also be of Hermogenean origin; I have in mind here Prodromos's phrase "sweet Syrian" (δὲ γλυκὺς Σύρος, *Against the Man with a Long Beard*, 25), as well as a longer fragment from the twelfth-century dialogue *Anacharsis or Ananias*:

Τίς ἂν μοι χρήσειε τὴν Σύραν γλῶσσαν, τὴν μελιχρὰν ἐκείνην καὶ φιλοκέρτομον καὶ Ὑμηττίου τοῦ Ἀττικοῦ ἡ δίονα μέλιτος, ἵτις Ἐλληνικὰ ἄττα παρεξέλεγχουσα ληρωδήματα πολὺν μυκτῆρα κατέχει καὶ νιφετούς σκωμμάτων κατεχαλάζωσε, δι’ ἣς οὐ μύθους οὐ δὲ φληνάφους, ἀλλ’ ἀληθεῖς ἄν λόγους παρεστησάμην τοῖς γράμμασιν.

Who would furnish me with the Syrian's tongue, honey-sweet, fond of jeering and more pleasant than honey from the Attic mountain Hymettus. This language, while refuting some Hellenic nonsense, poured down great sarcasm and showered like hail the storm of jokes. And through this language I would have put to writing neither myths nor nonsense but true stories.⁵⁴

Both fragments refer to the idea of sweetness, which must correspond to the "sweet style" described by Hermogenes in the chapter *Περὶ γλυκύτητος* of *On Various Kinds of Style*.⁵⁵ Psellos, in his short treatise *On the Styles of Certain Writings*, lists Lucian's works among the "graces," i.e., texts that are meant to be pleasant and entertaining (τι ἄλλο ἐπιτερπεῖ καὶ

53 See also Prodromos's testimony in PG 133:1293 (Hörandner 151): "καὶ ὁ Σύρος εἴρηκε ρήτωρ"; and Tzetzes, *Chiliades* 8.197.390: "Λουκιανὸς ὁ ρήτωρ τε τοῦτο πλατέως γράφει."

54 D. A. Christidis, *Μαρκιανὰ ἀνέκδοτα: 1. Ἀνάχαρσις ἢ Ἀνανίας; 2. Ἐπιστολές Σιγιλλίτων* (Thessalonike, 1984), 752–56.

55 See the detailed analysis of γλυκύτης in G. Lindberg, *Studies in Hermogenes and Eustathios: The Theory of Ideas and Its Application in the Commentaries of Eustathios on the Epics of Homer* (Lund, 1977), 229–31.

χάριτας ἔχον).⁵⁶ Pleasure is also one of the key concepts that characterize the “sweet style.” As Hermogenes explains, “sweet thoughts and those that give pleasure are especially ones that deal with myth” (“Ἐννοιαὶ δὲ γλυκεῖαι τε καὶ ὥδονὴν ἔχουσαι μάλιστα μὲν πᾶσαι αἱ μυθικαί, 2.4).⁵⁷ Therefore, the sweetness of Lucian’s style may be an allusion to his many stories concerning mythical characters. Moreover, as Gertrude Lindberg has demonstrated, Eustathios of Thessalonike uses the term γλυκύτης in connection with metaphors, which Lindberg grouped into three categories; “a) inanimate objects are presented as if they were living beings; b) a dead man is spoken to (or of) as if he were alive; c) dumb beings are spoken to (or of) as if they had will and reason.”⁵⁸ It is difficult not to link the second group with Lucian’s *Dialogues of the Dead*. What is more, the third group includes cases of jests and jibes, once again a quality ascribed to Lucianic texts. The passage from *Anacharsis* also points to the fact that this kind of sweet or mythical language can be used in the service of true—that is, Christian—stories.⁵⁹

56 F. Boissonade, *Michael Psellus de Operatione daemonum* (Nuremberg, 1838), 48. For the translation and discussion see S. Papaioannou, *Michael Psellos: Rhetoric and Authorship in Byzantium* (Cambridge, 2013), 127. For a similar description see Michael Gabras’s letter to Theodore Phialites, where he summarizes Phialites’ views on Lucian: “ὑπόθεσις γεγένηται σοι τοῦ γενναῖα καὶ χαρίτων πλήρη ταῦτα γράμματα ἔξενεγκείν” (163.5–6). Gabras’s letters edited in G. Fatouros, *Die Briefe des Michael Gabras (ca. 1290–nach 1350)* (Vienna, 1973), epp. 162 and 163 at 274–78.

57 Hermogenes’ *On Types of Style*, trans. C. W. Wootten (Chapel Hill, 1987), 75. Michael Italikos writes about the sweetness of Herodotus; cf. ep. 1 (ed. P. Gautier, in *Michel Italikos: Lettres et dishes cours*, ed. P. Gautier [Paris, 1972], 60.30) and ep. 18 (*ibid.*, 158.22). According to Gautier these are simply stereotypical formulae, but I see them more as rhetorical descriptions of various qualities of ancient authors. Hermogenes gives Herodotus’s writings as one of the examples of the sweet style.

58 Lindberg, *Studies in Hermogenes*, 232–33.

59 I think that a similar idea (especially regarding the phrase ἀληθεῖς λόγους) is expressed in the colophon to the *Christos Paschon* preserved in Paris, gr. 2875:

Ἐγεις ἀληθές δρᾶμα κού πεπλασμένον
πεφυρμένον τε μυθικῶν λήρων κόπρω
ό φιλομαθῆς εὐσεβοφρόνων λόγων. (Emphasis added)

On the Byzantine politics of appropriation of ancient models see P. Marciniak, “The Undead in Byzantium: Some Notes on the Reception of Ancient Literature in Twelfth-Century Byzantium,” *Troianalexandrina* 13 (2013): 95–111.

Testimonies from the later periods show very clearly that Lucian was considered one of the models of prose composition. The author of the rhetorical manual from the late twelfth or thirteenth century entitled *On the Four Parts of the Perfect Speech*, for instance, gives the following advice:

Ἀνάγνωθι Λευκίππην, Χαρίκλειαν, Λουκιανὸν,
Συνέσιον, Αλκίφρονος ἐπιστολάς. Ἡ πρώτη
χαρίτων καὶ ἄνθους γέμει, ἡ δευτέρα χαρίτων
μετὰ σωφροσύνης πλήρης, ὁ τρίτος παντοδαπόν
ἔχει τὸ καλόν, ὁ τέταρτος εμβούλος καὶ ὄγκηρός.
Αἱ ἐπιστολαὶ πολὺτὸ πιθανὸν καὶ εὔπλαστον
ἔχουσι. . . . Εἰ θέλεις εὐδοκιμεῖν ἐν τοῖς νῦν καιροῖς,
μικτοὺς ἐργάζου λόγους ἐκ τε ῥήτορικῶν ἐννοιῶν
καὶ φιλοσόφων.

Read Leukippe, Charikleia, Lucian, Synesios, letters of Alkiphrinos. The first one is full of grace and flowers [χαρίτων καὶ ἄνθους], the second filled with grace and sophrosyne, *the third one has all sorts of good things*, the fourth one is solemn and pompous. The letters are believable and well written. . . . If you want to succeed in our times, compose a speech mixed from both philosophical and rhetorical ideas.⁶⁰ (emphasis added)

The author then lists various writers whose texts can be examples of either mixed (Synesios, Themistios, Plutarch) or rhetorical writings (Libanios, Demosthenes, Lysias, Isocrates, and Lucian, who, however, sometimes has philosophical qualities). In the early fourteenth century, Theodore Metochites, commenting on differences between the authors from various parts of the Roman Empire, writes about Lucian and Libanios:

ἀμφοτέρω Σύρω ἄνδρε καὶ ὀνομαστώ γ' ἐν
ῥήτορεια καὶ γλώττης ἀσκήσει, καὶ πόλλ'
ἔξενεγκόντε βιβλία μετ' εὐστομίας θαυμάσια,
οἵ καίτοι γε τὸ Ἀττικίζειν ὑπερβαλλόντως σπου-
δάζοντες, οὕτω δὴ μάλιστα τὸ τῆς γλώττης ἵλαρὸν
ἡσπάσαντο καὶ προείλοντο καὶ οὐκ ἀτριπτον,

60 The new edition together with German translation and a commentary in W. Hörandner, “Pseudo-Gregorios Korinthios *Über die vier Teile der perfekten Rede*,” *Medioevo Greco* 12 (2012): 87–131, here at 105. The treatise reuses earlier material from the works of Psellos and Gregory of Corinth. See also A. Rhoby, “Labelling Poetry in the Middle and Late Byzantine Period,” *Byzantion* 85 (2015): 259–83.

ώστε καὶ ἐν οἷς τὸ Ἀττικίζειν φέρει πρός τιν' ἐκτροπὴν τοῦ ἑθίμου καὶ σκληρύνεται τοῖς ώσι, παρορῶσι τοῦτο καὶ οὐχ αἰροῦνται, οὐδὲ χαίρουσιν ὅτιοῦν οὕτω χρῆσθαι, πάντα τρόπον τὸ τῆς φωνῆς ἐρραστωνευμένον προκρίνοντες.

Both came from Syria, were famous for their rhetoric and linguistic schooling, and published a large number of books, admirably eloquent. Although they both were ardent Atticists and preferred a pleasant and unconstrained language, so that in those cases where Atticizing leads to a departure from normal usage and becomes unpleasant to the ear, they disregard it and prefer not to apply it. They do not like at all to write in that manner, since they always prefer an easy language.⁶¹

Theodore Phialites (fourteenth century) went as far as to suggest that Lucian is “so important for the thorough learning of the art of speaking, that if someone excludes Lucian he excludes with him all the other ancient orators” (163.77–78).⁶²

In the end, Lucian the atheist gave way to Lucian the master of style. Thus, in the Byzantine period, Lucian became the rhetor par excellence—though a Syrian, he achieved competence in using the Attic dialect, which was the ultimate aim of aspiring Byzantine students.

As I mentioned earlier, Lucian’s works, like ancient dramas, became lexical repositories, manuals of the Attic dialect, and guides to the Attic style. There was, however, a crucial difference between the works of Lucian and the texts of the Athenian playwrights: the latter were almost never imitated, even during the Hellenic turn of the twelfth century. This of course has much to do with the general Byzantine attitude toward theater.⁶³ Prodromos’s *Katomyomachia*, the anonymous *Christos Paschon*, and the *Dramation* by

61 K. Hult, *Theodore Metochites on Ancient Authors and Philosophy: Semeioseis gnomikai 1–26 & 71; A Critical Edition with Introduction, Translation, Notes and Indexes* (Goteborg, 2002), 162–63.

62 Christidis, “Theodore Phialites and Michael Gabras,” 543.

63 On theatre and performances in Byzantium see W. Puchner, “Zum Theater in Byzanz: Eine Zwischenbilanz,” in *Fest und Alltag in Byzanz: Festschrift für Hans-Georg Beck zum 18. Februar 1990*, ed. G. Prinzig and D. Simon (Munich, 1990), 11–16; idem, “Acting in the Byzantine Theatre: Evidence and Problems,” in *Greek and Roman Actors*, ed. P. Easterling and E. Hall (Cambridge, 2002), 304–24.

Michael Haploucheir remain the only examples of the (failed) attempt at reviving ancient dramatic genres.⁶⁴ Lucian, on the other hand, was extensively imitated, and the heyday of such imitation is the twelfth century.

The Twelfth-Century Lucianic Revival

Photios, in the above-mentioned codex 128, says of Lucian “καὶ ἀπλῶς, ὡς ἔφημεν, κωμῳδία τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐστὶν αὐτῷ ἡ σπουδὴ ἐν λόγῳ πεζῷ.” “And simply, as I said, his effort is [writing] comedy of the Hellenes in prose.” This is a very important statement. The notion that Lucian mocks (*κωμῳδεῖ*) is much older and appears, for instance, in the already mentioned passage from Isidore of Pelousion in the fifth century. Photios, however, interprets Lucian as a comedy writer. The word *κωμῳδία* widens its traditional meaning to signify also mockery or satire, and loses its genetic relationship to a precisely defined literary genre.⁶⁵ Perhaps the best examples here are the famous *Comedy of Katablattas* and another satirical piece written by Theodore II Laskaris.⁶⁶ In Paris. gr. 1310 (fifteenth century, fol. 216), there is a gloss stating that “Aristophanes was a teacher of Lucian” (ὅτι τοῦ Λουκιανοῦ μαῖστρωρ ἦν ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης).⁶⁷ Nikephoros Basilakes characterized Lucian as “ὅ γελοιαστής, ὁ φιλοπαίγμων ὁ κωμικός.” The same words were used by Theodore Prodromos in his *Bion Prasis* to describe Aristophanes.⁶⁸ In other words,

64 If indeed they were really meant to imitate ancient dramas: *Katomyomachia* and *Dramation* have, in fact, much in common with the satirical dialogues. As Katarzyna Warcaba argues in her PhD dissertation, *Katomyomachia* is a Byzantine version of a mock-heroic poem meant to be both a sequel and an imitation of *Batrachomyomachia*, rather than an attempt at reviving ancient drama; see K. Warcaba, “Imitatio et aemulatio Homeri in 12th Century Byzantium: A Study of Katomyomachia by Theodore Prodromos” (PhD diss., Katowice, 2016).

65 On the meaning of the word “comedy” as satire see W. Puchner, “Zur Geschichte der antiken Theaterterminologie im nachantiken Griechisch,” *Wiener Studien* 119 (2006): 86. See also Roilos, *Amphoterglossia*, 229.

66 P. Canivet and N. Oikonomides, “(Jean Argyropoulos) La comédie de Katablattas: Invective byzantine du XV^e siècle,” *Diptycha* 3 (1982–83): 5–97; Teodoro II Duca Lascari, *Satira del pedagogos*, ed. L. Tartaglia (Naples, 1992), 17: “κυροῦ Ιωάννου τοῦ Δούκα κωμῳδία.”

67 J. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1830; repr. Hildesheim 1962), 472, n. 2.

68 A. Pignani, “Un opusculogia male attribuito: L’encomio del cane di Niceforo Basilace,” *Le Parole e le idee* 11 (1969): 61. For the

the readers of their works clearly understood that both Aristophanes and Lucian operated within the same literary tradition. So Lucian is a mocker and a writer of comedy; his comedies, however, are better suited to be imitated than those of his teacher Aristophanes.

Most scholars agree that the true Lucianic revival came in the twelfth century.⁶⁹ Surprisingly enough, there is no single extant manuscript from this century that contains his works. This is curious, because, as Wilson remarked, the twelfth century “was not an age of declining book production.”⁷⁰ Moreover, the same period saw works created in the Lucianic style. Perhaps some of the manuscripts simply did not survive, although the “Lucianic activity” of this particular period would make us think that at least a few should have been handed down.

“Lucianic revival” means not only the use of words and phrases taken from Lucian. This was to be expected since he was a school author. Such a revival must also mean creating works modeled on Lucian. This may have happened even before the twelfth century, if we date *Philopatris* to the eleventh century.⁷¹ An undeniably Lucianic character is visible in such twelfth-century works as *Bion Prasis*, *Against an Old Man with a Long Beard*, *Against a Lustful Woman*, *Amathes*, and *Amarantos*. They were all written by the same Theodore Prodromos, a writer who clearly styled himself as the new Lucian.⁷² The anonymous Lucianic

description of Aristophanes in Prodromos see E. Cullhed’s edition in Marciniak, *Taniec w roli Terytyesa*, 196: “σύ δὲ πρώτος, ὁ Κωμικός, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν γέλων ἀπόρριψον καὶ τὰ σκῶμματα καὶ τὸ τραχὺ καὶ τὸ αὐθαδεῖς τίς γάρ ἂν σωφρονῶν γελοιαστὴν οἰκέτην καὶ παικτὴν πρίατο καὶ συνόλως ἐπίτριψα ἄγορᾶς;” (emphasis added).

69 See for instance E. Mattioli, *Luciano e l’umanesimo* (Naples, 1980), 23–29. See also Roilos, *Amphoteroglossia*, 231–35; T. Migliorini, “Gli scritti satirici in greco letterario di Teodoro Prodromo: Introduzione, edizione, traduzione e commenti” (PhD dissertation, Pisa, 2010), xx (though he speaks more of a general satirical revival).

70 Wilson, “Some Observations,” 57.

71 Incerti auctoris, *Philopatris i didaskomenos: Recensuit, praefatus est R. Anastasi* (Messina, 1968); R. Anastasi, “Tradizione e innovazione nella satira bizantina: Le satire pseudoluciane,” *Atti della Accademia Peloritana dei Pericolanti, Classe di Lettere, Filosofia e Belle Arti* 66 (1990): 57–73. See the surprisingly negative article by M. J. Edwards, “Lucian of Samosata in Christian Memory,” *Byzantium* 80 (2010): 142–55.

72 A. Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium: The Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition* (Cambridge, 2008), 251 and 258.

satire *Timarion* bears so much resemblance to the other works of Prodromos that even if he is not its author, it looks like a work created by somebody from his immediate circle.⁷³

There exist a few texts influenced by Lucian’s writings that were not penned by Prodromos; the degree, however, of their dependence on the Syrian satirist may vary. The anonymous διάλογος νεκρικός between Charon, Hermes, and Alexander the Great is a centonic composition built upon phrases taken mostly from Lucian’s *Dialogues of the Dead*. Yet its dating is uncertain and other, much later, alternatives have been proposed.⁷⁴ Undoubtedly Lucianic in character is the *Dialogue of the Dead*, satirizing the late Stephanos Hagiocchristophorites, *logothetes tou genikou*, yet inasmuch as it is a clearly political satire it is a unique piece; it is also quite late (1185).⁷⁵ The third text, the anonymous *Anacharsis or Ananias*, is ascribed to Niketas Eugenianos.⁷⁶ *Anacharsis*, however, a dialogue (which in fact quickly becomes a soliloquy) between one Aristagoras and Lady Grammar, can perhaps be seen more as an example of using dialogue as a genre (which

73 On the possible authorship of *Timarion* see R. Romano, “Sulla possibile attribuzione del ‘Timarione’ pseudolucianeo a Nicola Callicle,” *Giornale italiano di filologia*, n.s. 4, 25 (1973): 309–15; B. Baldwin, “The Authorship of the *Timarion*,” *BZ* 77 (1984): 233–37; R. Romano, “Ancora sulla attribuzione del Timarione pseudolucianeo,” *Vichiana: Rassegna di studi filologici e storici* 16 (1987): 169–76. On the similarities between the *Timarion* and *Katomyomachia* see H. Hunger, *Der byzantinische Katz-Mäuse-Krieg: Theodoros Prodromos, Katomyomachia; Einleitung, Text und Übersetzung* (Vienna, 1968), 61–62.

74 O. Karsay, “Eine byzantinische Imitation von Lukianos,” *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 19 (1971): 383–91, who proposes the Palaiologan period. The first edition (about which Karsay did not know) was N. Caccia, *Note sulla fortuna di Luciano nel Rinascimento: Le versioni e i dialoghi satirici di Erasmo da Rotterdam e di Ulrico Hutten* (Milan, 1914?), 145–49. See also T. M. Sokolova, “Jesce odno vizantiskoje ‘podrazanje’ Lukianu,” in *Antyczność I Wizantija* (Moscow, 1975), 195–203; D. A. Christidis, “Τιὰ τὴν βυζαντινὴν μίμησην τοῦ Λουκιανοῦ στὸν κώδ. Ambrosianus gr. 655,” *Hellenika* 32 (1980): 86–91. The twelfth century was suggested by both S. Lambakis, “Οι καταβάσεις στον κάτω κόσμο στη Βυζαντινή και στη μεταβυζαντινή λογοτεχνία” (PhD dissertation, Athens, 1982), 94–95, and L. Garland, “Mazaris’s Journey to Hades: Further Reflections and Reappraisal,” *DOP* 61 (2007): 185.

75 Translation and introduction by L. Garland, “A Treasury Minister in Hell—a Little Known Dialogue of the Dead of the Late Twelfth Century,” *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook* 17 (2000/2001): 481–89.

76 By its editor, Christidis: *Ἀνέκδοτα Μαρχιανά*, 78–92, 107–19.

was associated with Lucian) than as a direct imitation of Lucian.⁷⁷ Moreover, Eugenianos was a student of Prodromos. If he really was the author of *Anacharsis*, it may be seen as further evidence that Prodromos's circle was involved in the Lucianic revival. Finally, there is an anonymous satirical monody that shows a dependence on Lucian, including *Peri penthou*.⁷⁸ Yet again, its editor, Alexander Sideras, proposed as its possible author Theodore Prodromos.⁷⁹

Therefore what is described as the “Lucianic revival” seems to be prompted by one prolific writer, Theodore Prodromos, who may have influenced his peers and colleagues who attended the same *theatron* (or *theatra*). This would not be surprising; Prodromos also seems to have been responsible for reviving at least one other ancient genre: the novel.⁸⁰

Perhaps this explains why there are no extant manuscripts from the twelfth century. In fact, apart from the writings of Prodromos, the interest in Lucian was not much different from what it had been in the previous centuries; there was no need for a greater number of Lucianic manuscripts then. On the other hand, the great number of surviving manuscripts from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries corresponds well with the intensified interest in Lucian in the works of, for instance, Thomas Magistros, Manuel Philes, and Theodore Metochites. What is interesting is that whereas the twelfth-century authors (or author) were interested in using Lucian's works mainly as literary models, the Palaiologan scholars seem to have treated him rather as yet another source of the Attic dialect and

a stylistic model. The only serious exception, apart from the poem of Philes mentioned earlier, could be three anonymous dialogues that were thought to have been penned by John Katrakes, though their exact chronology remains impossible to establish.⁸¹ Of course, ascribing the “Lucianic revival” to Prodromos does not diminish its importance; it only changes the perspective.

Lucian as a Dialogic Literary Model

The relationships between Lucianic models and the Byzantine texts operate on many levels, and it is beyond the scope of this article to discuss them all. I will focus here only on one of them: the architextual relation denoted by genre or discourse type; in this case dialogue, or more precisely, the so-called Lucianic dialogue.⁸²

Perhaps the Christians of late antiquity did not “dialogue” to the same extent as their Athenian

⁷⁷ The possible Lucianic character of these dialogues requires further investigation. The dating of these dialogues (*Hermodotos*, *Musokles*, *Hermippus*) is uncertain and many different dates have been proposed. According to Kroll the texts may have originated in the fifth century, while other authors have proposed the Palaiologan period. The authors of the recently published German translation suggest that they were created sometime between the eleventh and fourteenth centuries (the oldest extant manuscript of *Hermippus* comes from 1322). As earlier scholars convincingly showed, all three texts are interrelated. Therefore it was believed, and not without good reason, that they were penned by the same person: John Katrakes, a late Byzantine copyist and intellectual. Other candidates have also been proposed as possible authors. It is plausible, however, that even though the texts were not authored by the same person, they originated in the same intellectual milieu (*theatron*?). Yet there is not enough evidence to accept any of these theories, and the dialogues remain anonymous. Editions: *Hermippus' Anonymi christiani Hermippus, De Astrologia dialogus*, ed. W. Kroll and P. Viereck (Leipzig 1895). The editio princeps, based on one manuscript only, was published in 1830 in Copenhagen by O. D. Bloch. On *Hermodotos* and *Musokles* see A. Elter, “Io. Katrarii Hermodotus et Musocles dialogi,” in *Natalicia regis augustissimi Guilelmi II imperatoris Germanorum* (Bonn, 1898), 5–54. On the dialogues see Anonymus Byzantinus, *Lebensleben in drei Dialogen: Hermodotos, Musokles, Hermippus*, ed. O. Schönberger and E. Schönberger (Würzburg, 2010), with further bibliography. On the authorship of the dialogues see A. Hohlweg, “Drei anonyme Texte suchen einen Autor,” *Byzantiaka* 15 (1995): 15–45. On the possible dependence on Lucian see F. Schumacher, *De Ioanne Katrario Luciani imitatore* (Bonn, 1898). Schumacher accepts Katrakes's authorship of the dialogues, which influenced his analysis.

⁷⁸ G. Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, trans. C. Newman and C. Doubinsky (Lincoln, 1997), 4.

⁷⁹ P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180* (Cambridge, 2002), 347 speaks of “a large debt to Lucian.”

⁸⁰ A. Sideras, *Eine byzantinische Invektive gegen die Verfasser von Grabreden: Ἀνώνυμον μονῳδία εἰς μονῳδοῦντας* (Vienna, 2002). See also D. Christidis, “Η αγώνυμη Μονῳδία εἰς Μονῳδοῦντας και η Απολογία του Λουκιανού,” *Hellenika* 53 (2003): 391–94.

⁷⁹ Sideras, *Eine byzantinische Invektive*, 22–25. This is perhaps too far-fetched a proposition, as *similia* juxtaposed by Sideras look somewhat incidental. Moreover, Niel Gaul in his review of the edition (BZ 100 [2007]: 257–61) suggested that this invective should be dated rather to the fourteenth century.

⁸⁰ See P. Roilos, *Amphoterglossia*, 7–11; R. Beaton, *The Medieval Greek Romance* (Cambridge, 1989), 67. See also the discussion about dating of the novels in *Four Byzantine Novels: Theodore Prodromos, Rhodanthe and Dosikles, Eumathios Makrembolites, Hysmine and Hysminias, Constantine Manasses, Aristandros and Kallitheia, Niketas Eugenianos, Drosilla and Charikles*, trans. E. Jeffreys, TTB 1 (Liverpool, 2012).

predecessors,⁸³ but twelfth-century Byzantium saw the rebirth of the genre. Paul Magdalino sees the famous *Timarion* as the first dialogue that discusses profane matters.⁸⁴ This may or may not be true, if *Philopatris* can be safely dated to the eleventh century. But even if *Philopatris* is indeed earlier, *Timarion* is a better representative of a new type of dialogue that came into existence (or in Magdalino's words "was revived") in Byzantium. Alexander Kazhdan and Ihor Ševčenko, discussing "dialogue" in the *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, remark that "throughout their history the Byzantines imitated two main types of antique dialogue: the Platonizing/philosophical and the Lucianic/satirical."⁸⁵ However convenient this division may seem, it is unfortunately not so simple. The anonymous dialogue *Charidemos*, edited by Macleod in the fourth volume of his *Luciani Opera*, which includes spurious texts, is certainly treated as "pseudo-Lucianic," though it is also modeled on Platonic dialogues.⁸⁶ The boundary between satirical and philosophical dialogues is a fluid one and contemporary divisions are highly conventional. For instance, *Amarantos, or the Passions of the Old Man*, in the recent edition was called "the satirical dialogue."⁸⁷ Yet as Eric Cullhed argues, its content is very serious, as the text experiments with the problems of theodicy, hedonism, dissimulation, and literary fiction.⁸⁸

I would even go so far as to suggest that "dialogue" (or more precisely profane dialogue) as an independent

⁸³ S. Goldhill, ed., *The End of Dialogue in Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2009). See also Av. Cameron, "Can Christians Do Dialogue?" *Studia Patristica* 63 (2013): 103–20, and eadem, "Arguing It Out: Discussion in Twelfth-Century Byzantium," Natalie Zemon Davis Lectures 2014 (Budapest, 2016).

⁸⁴ Magdalino, *Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, 395.

⁸⁵ ODB 1:618. See also the recent discussion in Av. Cameron, *Dialoguing in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA, 2014).

⁸⁶ As argued by R. Anastasi, "Appunti sul Charidemus," *Siculorum Gymnasium* 18 (1965): 260–61. What makes the distinction even more unreliable is the fact that some of Lucian's dialogues in fact depend on Socrato-Platonic tradition. On Lucian's adaptation of philosophical dialogues see Nesselrath, "Lukian von Samosata," 682–83.

⁸⁷ T. Migliorini, "Teodoro Prodromo, *Amaranto*," *Medioevo Greco* 7 (2007): 183–247.

⁸⁸ E. Cullhed, "Teodoro Pródromo en el Jardín de Epicuro," in *Aproximaciones interdisciplinarias a la antigüedad griega y latina*, VI Jornadas Filológicas, Bogotá, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Universidad de los Andes, Universidad de la Sabana, ed. R. Álvarez and L. Almandós (Bogotá, 2015), 369–93.

genre became inextricably linked to Lucian, perhaps even much more than to Plato.⁸⁹ Lucian built his dialogues upon the Platonic tradition, both subsuming and reinventing it, as the personified Dialogue complains in *Double Indictment*: "[He] took away my serious, tragic mask and gave me a comic one. Then he placed me in close confinement with Jest and Satire and Cynicism and Eupolis and Aristophanes" (*Double Indictment*, 33, trans. Macleod). Dialogue is "a characteristic form of philosophy, especially Platonic, which had now become a weapon of satire against its old friend."⁹⁰ The question, of course, is why the Byzantines in the twelfth century (and later) rebooted the genre that is supposed to be closely connected with free and democratic speaking. The story of Byzantine secular or Lucianic dialogues has yet to be written, but it is obvious that a simple transposition of the ancient genre to the Byzantine literary reality was impossible.⁹¹ Byzantine Lucianic dialogues, in most cases, are not polyphonic in the Bakhtinian sense; there is no plurality of voices. Their meanings, I believe, were created only in context, in the particular situation in which the dialogues were performed. Some of the dialogues may have originated in a school context and for school purposes (Prodromos's *Bion Prasis* or, I would argue, the anonymous *Hermippus*),⁹² while others

⁸⁹ A. Hohlweg hinted at a similar conclusion in his discussion on three anonymous Byzantine dialogues: *Hermippus*, *Hermodotos*, and *Musokles*; see Hohlweg, "Drei anonyme Texte," 19. On the use of the term *dialogos* to denote a separate literary genre see K. Jazdżewska, "From *dialogos* to *dialogue*: The Use of the Term from Plato to the Second Century CE," *GRBS* 54 (2014): 17–36. It is ironic that Prodromos chose a Lucian-styled text, "Plato-lover, or Leather-worker," to praise Plato. In this work Prodromos duly credits Plato with the invention of dialogue; Migliorini, *Gli scritti satirici*, 69: "Πλάτωνος οἱ διάλογοι."

⁹⁰ S. Swain, "The Three Faces of Lucian," in *Lucian of Samosata Vivus et Redivivus*, ed. C. Ligota and L. Panizza (London, 2007), 26. See also G. Bardy, "Dialog," in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, ed. T. Klauser, vol. 3 (Stuttgart, 1957), 930: "Erst Lukian verwandte ihn im klassischen Raum für Satiren und Parodien."

⁹¹ Cameron, *Dialoguing in Late Antiquity*. For a similar question regarding the influence of Lucian in the twelfth century see E. C. Bourbouhakis, "The End of ἐπιδεξίς: Authorial Identity and Authorial Intention in Michael Chōniatēs' Πρὸς τοὺς αἰτιωμένους τὸ ἀφίλενθεικτον," in *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature: Modes, Functions, and Identities* (Boston, 2014), 213, no. 26.

⁹² Writing about a much earlier period, Cameron remarked, "Moreover, the imaginary debate or dialogue was rooted in the rhetorical educational system of the classical world, in which it was a standard school exercise to compose imaginary debates on

were possibly meant to be voices in discussions among intellectual peers and colleagues (e.g., *Amarantos*).

As Brill's *New Pauly* noted: “[Lucian] experimented with various forms of dialogue and created new ones by crossing typical comedy motifs (*Prometheus* 5–7) with those of the cynical satire of Menippus (*Bis accusatus* 33).”⁹³ Similarly, Byzantine “satirical” dialogues written in the Lucianic vein—the description “pseudo-Lucianic” is a rather confusing one—are often cross-literary experiments. The twelfth-century anonymous *Timarion* includes such elements as ekphrasis, dialogues within the dialogue, and even a trial scene, which has an undeniably theatrical character.⁹⁴ Similarly Prodromos’s *Bion Prasis* and *Amarantos* show how fluid the boundary between the “dialogical” and the “performative” can be. *Bion Prasis* is much more dynamic than Lucian’s model (which features only lives of philosophers), and the fact that it was in all probability meant to be read aloud makes us think about the text more as “performative” than simply “dialogical.”⁹⁵

the subject of critical moments in Greek and Roman history”; Av. Cameron, “Disputations, Polemical Literature and the Formation of Opinion in the Early Byzantine Period,” in *Dispute Poems and Dialogues in the Ancient and Mediaeval Near East: Forms and Types of Literary Debates in Semitic and Related Literatures*, ed. G. J. Reinink and H. L. J. Vanstiphout (Leuven, 1991), 100. This, as I think, holds true for later periods as well.

93 “Dialogue” in Brill's *New Pauly*, accessed 20 December 2014.

94 Pseudo-Luciano, *Timarione*. English translation: *Timarion*, trans. B. Baldwin (Detroit, 1984). On the trial scene in *Timarion* see R. Macrides, “The Law outside the Lawbooks: Law and Literature,” *Fontes Minores* 11 (2005): 133–45, esp. 139–41.

95 This has been already noticed by G. Podestá, “Teodor Prodromo e la sua satira nella Bisanzio del XII secolo,” *Studium: Rivista bimestrale di cultura* 60 (1964): 32: “[Amarantos] oscilla tra il dialogo lucianesco e il mimo drammatico.” Walter Puchner seems to draw an uncrossable line between drama and dialogue; see W. Puchner, “Geschichte der antiken Theaterterminologie,” 81: “Die Dialogform allein stellt noch kein dramatisches Element vor.” However, dialogue is almost always discussed from or within the dramatic perspective; see R. Courtney, *Drama and Intelligence: A Cognitive Theory* (Montreal, 1990), 152. Such an approach to dialogue is not a modern conception but has its roots in antiquity; see J. A. Arierti, *Interpreting Plato: The Dialogues as Drama* (Savage, MD, 1991). It is also worth noting that Alexios Makrembolites, in his allegorical interpretation, describes *Lucius or the Ass* as “drama.” Constantine Akropolites also refers to *Timarion* as “drama.” Already Walden in his study on Heliodorus’s *Aethiopika*, where he also discussed Byzantine testimonies, concluded: “The δρᾶμα as thus understood, then, would be a narrative or description of any sort that told about happenings, adventures, whether those happenings were within

What is more, the dialogical texts modeled on Lucian can differ among themselves on a structural level. In *Timarion*, as in *Charidemos*, the role of the second interlocutor is reduced to that of a marker of changes or continuity of the narrative structure: Kydion’s participation in the conversation is limited mostly to statements like “Do get on with your story” (ch. 2); “My friend, you have the exasperating way of telling a story, all précis and resume, never really telling us what we want to know” (ch. 3); “His [Timarion’s] stories tend to have a beginning and end but no middle” (ch. 4).⁹⁶ This process seems to have gone even further in the two other dialogues classified as Lucianic: *Musokles* and *Hermippus*. In both of these dialogues the second speaker remains anonymous. Therefore, the speakers do not really exchange any ideas; the anonymous interlocutor serves to delineate the narrative framework of the dialogue and to ask questions. The second speaker became even less important than in the other Lucianic dialogues *Charidemos* and *Timarion*, which may prove that the dialogic form evolved, or that it could be altered according to the author’s needs.⁹⁷

Lucian Reinterpreted

Lucian’s metamorphosis from pagan and “destroyer of gods” to the embodiment of laughter seems complete in one of Philes’ poems, on the martyr Lucian of Antioch (fourth century CE), who also happened to be born in Samosata and also has his lemma in the *Souda*. In the last part of the poem, Philes compares the saint to Lucian the writer:

“Ελληνες ούκοῦν αἰσχυνέσθωσαν πάλιν,
Εἰ Λουκιανὸς ἄλλος ἡμῖν εὐρέθη
Τοῦ Λουκιανοῦ τοῦ παρ’ αὐτοῖς βελτίων.
Ο μὲν γὰρ ἀφεὶς τὸν γελώμενον βίον,

the bounds of possibility and probability or not; whether they (and the *πρόσωπα*) were pure inventions of the author or not” (J. W. H. Walden, “Stage-Terms in Heliodorus’s *Aethiopica*,” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 5 [1894]: 22). By no means am I suggesting that these texts were understood as “dramas” in the ancient sense of this term, but rather that the term itself came to denote a wider group of fictitious texts, including dialogues.

96 Translation after Baldwin, *Timarion*.

97 Both dialogues were written perhaps as didactic pieces, in which case the anonymous interlocutor could be seen as a model student asking his teachers questions (especially in *Musokles*).

Θυμηδίαν ἄρρενστον ἀντιλαμβάνει, (25)
 Καὶ ζῆ παρεστῶς τῷ θεῷ σὺν ἀγγέλοις.
 Οὐ δὲ πλατὺς ἀντικρυς εὑρέθη γέλως
 Καὶ παρασυρεῖς ταῖς τρυφαῖς καὶ τοῖς πότοις
 Κεῖται λυθεὶς ἄκλαυστος εἰς πόνου τόπον⁹⁸

May the Hellenes feel again ashamed
 if another Lucian was considered by us
 a better one than their Lucian.
 This one having given up a laughable life
 received in exchange imperishable joy.
 And he lives standing beside God and angels.
 The other one is clearly a big joke,⁹⁹
 carried away by luxury and drinks,
 he lies unburied dead and unwept in the place
 of pain.

The last verse of the poem is especially baffling: Philes appears to allude to the story recorded in the *Souda* according to which Lucian, killed by dogs, ended up in Hell. However, unlike in the *Souda*, Lucian is not condemned because of his anti-Christian attitude but because of laughter.¹⁰⁰ Philes, in my view, implies that Lucian was both a laughingstock and a person who could make people laugh. Moreover, by stressing the difference between Lucian the comedian and Lucian the martyr, Philes refers to the well-established opposition between earthly laughter, which can always lead to sin, and heavenly joy.¹⁰¹ Philes' two poems, the one

98 *Manuelis Philae Carmina*, no. 211, ed. E. Miller (Paris, 1855), 1.103.

99 I am grateful to Dr. Aglae Pizzone for her help with rendering this line in English.

100 Michael Gabras, a member of the same literary circle as Philes, expressed his anti-Lucianic sentiments, this time in a much more aggressive way, accusing Lucian, among other things, of impiety (*ψήτε θεῖον τι πρεσβεύων*, ep. 162). As Christidis points out, in his correspondence with Theodore Phialites (fourteenth century), Michael Gabras "refuses absolutely and intensely any possibility of using the work of Lucian in the education of his contemporaries"; see Christidis, "Theodore Phialites," 542. I am inclined to think, however, that this is once again an isolated opinion (perhaps of the same circle of intellectuals?). What is more, as can be inferred from Gabras's letters, Phialites did not share Gabras's aversion.

101 On traditional Byzantine notions regarding laughing see for instance N. Adkin, "The Fathers on Laughter," *Orpheus* 6 (1985): 149–52 and recently P. Marcinia, "Byzantine Humour," in

mentioned earlier and a poem on the martyr Lucian, encapsulate some Byzantine thinking about Lucian: on the one hand his writings possess qualities that make them suitable for school purposes, but on the other hand Lucian himself (and Lucian understood as the personification of his texts) is equated with mockery and becomes the embodiment of sinful laughter. This double, and only seemingly contradictory, interpretation shows well how and why Lucian and his writings found their place in Byzantine culture. The Byzantine discussions of Lucian betray a constant tension between two aspects of his works: the pleasant and useful style and the inappropriate content, full of lies. Yet the didactic usefulness of Lucian's writings outweighed all the potential dangers hidden in the fabric of his texts—his anti-Christian attitude, his jokes causing unseemly laughter, and the idleness of his works. What saved Lucian was one of the most important principles governing Byzantine literature: the idea of usefulness, ὡφέλεια.¹⁰² Alexios Makrembolites, quoted at the beginning of this paper, who was a contemporary of Philes, went even further. His allegorical interpretation of *Lucius or the Ass* was meant to show this text's Christian dimension.¹⁰³ Makrembolites ends his reading of *Lucius* with the following:

Τοιοῦτον ἐγώ νοῦν ἔντεῦθεν συνέλεξα καὶ με
 μηδεὶς ἐπιλήψεται ῥόδον ἐξ ἀκάνθης τρυγήσαντα,
 ἢ ἐκ θαλάσσης ἀλμυρᾶς πότιμον ὕδωρ ἐντέχως
 ἀποπιάσαντα.

I have gathered such a meaning and nobody will
 blame me if I have picked roses from the thorns

Encyclopedia of Humor Studies, ed. S. Attardo (Los Angeles, 2014), 1:98–102.

102 G. Cavallo, *Lire à Byzance*, trans. P. Odorico and A. Segonds (Paris, 2006), 19.

103 Interestingly enough *Lucius or the Ass* is mentioned in *Mazarius's Journey to Hades* 39.14–15: The younger Alousianos (straight from the house of Patrokles, who never washed), belongs to the inner circle, with Loukios "or the ass"; *Mazarius's Journey to Hades or Interviews with Dead Men about Certain Officials of the Imperial Court*, Greek text with translation, notes, introduction and index by Seminar Classics 609, State University of New York at Buffalo (Buffalo, 1975). If Loukios/Lucius is understood here as Lucian himself, then perhaps this is yet another allusion to Lucian's dwelling-place in Hell.

or skillfully extracted drinkable water from the salty sea.¹⁰⁴

This passage is an obvious allusion to Basil the Great's *On Greek Literature* (ch. 4).¹⁰⁵ As Panagiotis Roilos observed, Makrembolites highlights a difference between the story of the text (ὑπόθεσις) and its meaning

(γοῦν).¹⁰⁶ Such a distinction allowed Makrembolites to ignore semipornographic content and focus on the alleged allegorical meaning of the text. In principle this holds true for Lucian's entire literary output. This kind of approach allowed Lucian's writings to be saved because of their literary qualities and because they were undeniably useful for the young adepts of rhetorical studies, even though their content might have been problematic.

University of Silesia
Center for Research on Byzantine
Literature and Reception
pl. Sejmu Śląskiego 1
40-032 Katowice
Poland
przemyslaw.marciniak@us.edu.pl

¹⁰⁴ Papadopoulos-Kerameus, "Αλεξίου τοῦ Μακρεμβολίτου ἀλληγορία," 23. Translation after Roilos, *Amphoteroglossia*, 135.

¹⁰⁵ καὶ καθάπερ τῆς ροδωνιᾶς τοῦ ἄνθους δρεψάμενοι τὰς ἀκάνθας ἐκκλινομεν, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων λόγων ὅσον χρήσιμον καρπωσάμενοι, τὸ βλαβερὸν φυλαξώμεθα "And just as in plucking the blooms from a rose-bed we avoid the thorns, so also in garnering from such writings whatever is useful, let us guard ourselves against what is harmful." Basil, *On Greek Literature*, in *Letters*, vol. 4, *Letters 249–368*, ed. and trans. R. J. Deferrari and M. R. P. McGuire (Cambridge, MA, 1934).

¹⁰⁶ Roilos, *Amphoteroglossia*, 136.

THIS PAPER IS PART OF RESEARCH FUNDED BY the Polish National Science Centre, grant no. DEC-2011/03/B/HS2/03618. I am grateful for helpful criticism and remarks to Dr. Nikolaos Zagklas, Dr. Janek Kucharski, Dr. Andreas Rhoby, and Dr. Katarzyna Warcaba. My special thanks go to Dr. Charis Messis,

who let me read his own paper on Lucian in Byzantium and offered useful comments. The reports of the two anonymous readers allowed me to avoid mistakes and simplifications. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Dr. Adam Goldwyn, who was kind enough to improve the English. All remaining errors are of course mine.

Appendix

Manuel Philes' *metaphrasis* of the verses of Lucian on the painting depicting the wedding of Alexander:¹⁰⁷

Behold, a chamber in which there is a bridal couch
On which modestly [sits] beautiful Roxane
The girl has her eyes cast down as if ashamed
Not to look at Alexander who stands there.
There is an Eros behind [her]
Removing the veil from her head
He shows the beloved one to the bridegroom.
Another one takes the shoe off her foot,
Bent on his knees as if he were a servant.
He would like to prepare her for bed.
Yet another one having grabbed his [Alexander's]
coat
Pulls him vehemently to Roxane.
So the king is next to her, giving the virgin
A bridal crown before the wedding.
And Hephaestion was present leading the bride
to the bridegroom's house
Who [Hephaestion], having leaned completely
on some young boy

¹⁰⁷ Manuelis Philae Carmina, 336–37 (appendix, no. 3).

So shining and, my dear, and bursting with strength

(the art seems to suggest this is Hymenaios),
Shows a blaze of a bridal lamp.

On the other hand, other pleasant Erotes
extraordinarily

Play amongst the armours of the bridegroom.

There are two of them, as you can see,
Who have his sword on their shoulders.

Two others drag the royal one, who is weaker,
on the shield

Seizing it by the leather handgrips. 25

Some other has gone inside the corslet.

Soon he will terrify the swarm of his friends
When the corslet falls all its weight on them.

However, it is not just the picture and story that
you see

But one can learn from the things one sees 30

That even Alexander himself as he went to get
married

Was kept away from the works of Ares.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁸ Robinson (*Lucian and His Influence*, 69) translates differently: “that even Alexander at His wedding / could not put off his love for warlike things.” I think, however, that he is attempting to faithfully render Lucian’s text, whereas Philes’ conclusion seems to be different. What is perhaps important is that the conclusion is not part of the ekphrasis, but rather an interpretation of the beholder. That may be why Philes’ ending is different than Lucian’s.